R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 012 289 UD 003 633

FREE CHOICE OPEN ENROLLMENT - JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS.

BY- THORNDIKE, ROBERT L. AND OTHERS
CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION, NEW YORK, N.Y.

PUB DATE 31 AUG 66

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.09 HC-$1.12 28P.

DESCRIPTORS- *FREE CHOICE TRANSFER PROGRAMS, *GRADE 7, *OPEN ENROLLMENT, *MINORITY GROUP CHILDREN, *EVALUATION, JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS, RESEARCH METHODOLOGY, RATING SCALES, TEACHER ATTITUDES, STUDENT ATTITUDES, PARENT ATTITUDES, COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS, ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT, READING TESTS, FRIENDSHIP, PEER RELATIONSHIP, ADMINISTRATOR ATTITUDES, SCHOOL ATTITUDES, ATTENDANCE, STUDENT BEHAVIOR, ADJUSTMENT (TO ENVIRONMENT), SCHOOL INTEGRATION, DATA, NEW YORK CITY, ESEA TITLE I

AN EVALUATION OF A FREE CHOICE, OPEN ENROLLMENT PROGRAM, IN WHICH SEVENTH-GRADE MINORITY GROUP CHILDREN HAD THE OPPORTUNITY TO TRANSFER TO RACIALLY BALANCED JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS OUTSIDE THEIR NEIGHBORHOODS, RECORDED THE RESPONSES OF THE PUPILS, PARENTS, AND TEACHERS IN THE RECEIVING SCHOOLS. THE COMPARATIVE ASSESSMENT OF ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT, SCHOOL BEHAVIOR AND DISCIPLINE, PEER ACCEPTANCE, AND SCHOOL ATTITUDES OF THE 263 OPEN ENROLLMENT PUPILS AND THE 257 NONOPEN ENROLLMENT PUPILS IN THE SAME 13 JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS WERE GATHERED FROM SCHOOL RECORDS AND PUPIL-COMPLETED RATING FORMS AND QUESTIONNAIRES. TEACHER, ADMINISTRATOR, AND PARENT ATTITUDES AND EVALUATIONS WERE ASSESSED BY QUESTIONNAIRES. GENERAL FINDINGS INDICATED THAT, IN COMPARISON WITH NATIONAL NORMS AND NONOPEN ENROLLMENT CLASSMATES, THE OPEN ENROLLMENT PUPILS HAD A HIGHER INCIDENCE OF UNSATISFACTORY GRADES IN ACADEMIC SUBJECTS. HOWEVER, THE TWO GROUPS OF PUPILS DID NOT DIFFER MARKEDLY IN THEIR ATTENDANCE, EXTENT OF DISCIPLINARY PROBLEMS, FAVORABLE ATTITUDES TOWARD SCHOOL, AND PEER ACCEPTANCE. THE PARENTS OF THE OPEN ENROLLMENT PUPILS FOR THE MOST PART WERE FAVORABLE TOWARD THE PRESENT SCHOOL OF THEIR CHILDREN, BUT THE TEACHERS AND ADMINISTRATORS TENDED TO VIEW NEGATIVELY THE OPEN ENROLLMENT PUPILS. (JL)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED012289

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION
33 West 42nd Street, New York

Educational Practices Division
Nathan Brown, Associate Director

Evaluation of New York City School District educational projects funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (Pl 89-10) - performed under contract with the Board of Education of the City of New York, 1965-66 School Year.

Joseph Krevisky
Research Coordinator, Title I Projects

FREE CHOICE OPEN ENROLLMENT - JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS

Dr. Robert L. Thorndike
Research Director

August 31, 1966

I. Plan of the Study

The study described in this report was carried out for the Center for Urban Education, at the request of the New York City Department of Education, in order to provide an interim evaluation of the Open Enrollment Program in the New York City junior high schools. The Open Enrollment Program (referred to throughout the remainder of this report as OEP) is one in which pupils are transferred, upon the request of a parent or guardian, from a predominantly segregated neighborhood school to one in which a reasonable degree of racial balance exists. The objective is to provide Negro and Puerto Rican pupils the presumed advantages of an integrated educational experience.

This study was limited to pupils in the seventh grade who were in the OEP for the first time during the academic year 1965-66. Department of Education records indicate that there were about 1150 pupils meeting this specification, and that they were assigned to 17 receiving junior high schools. A sampling of this group was chosen for study. In those schools having more than 20 pupils, the sample was limited to approximately 20. Only some of the schools having smaller numbers of OEP pupils were reached, and an attempt was made in these cases to include all pupils. As a practical expedient, so far as possible home-rooms were chosen that included 4 to 6 OEP pupils, and the sample consisted of the pupils in those rooms.*

---

*This sampling procedure may have tended to introduce some bias into the sample and to get the more "average" OEP pupils. Where home-room groupings were based on a previous reading test, or some other indicator of academic ability, the OEP pupil who was outstanding - at either the high or low end - so that he was the only OEP pupil (or one of 2 or 3) in a home-room, would have been excluded from the sample.

Data were gathered for a total of 263 OEP pupils from 64 homerooms in 13 schools.* In order to have some reference group with which to compare these pupils, data were also gathered for 257 other pupils attending the same classes in the same schools. For each OEP pupil, a comparison pupil was chosen from the same homeroom. In almost every case (excepting when the supply ran out) the comparison pupil (designated as a non-OEP or NOEP pupil from here on for convenience) was of the same sex as the OEP pupil. Normally he was chosen from the alphabetic class list and was the NOEP pupil of the same sex who was closest in the alphabet to the OEP pupil.

It would have been desirable to have had another comparison group made up of pupils from the same sending school as the OEP pupil, but going to the seventh grade in a neighborhood junior high school. Unfortunately, limited resources of time and personnel made this impractical. Thus no comparisons are possible between OEP pupils and their erstwhile classmates from elementary school.

Information was obtained from a variety of sources, and about a number of aspects of the pupils' adjustment to their school setting. Sources of information were: school records, questionnaires and rating forms filled out by pupils, behavior check lists and opinionaires filled out by teachers and school officials, and a questionnaire completed by part of the parents. Evidence was assembled on academic achievement, school behavior and discipline, peer acceptance, liking for the school, and the success of the program as perceived by parents and by school teaching and administrative personnel. The evidence on these different outcomes will be presented in the following sections.

*Because of absences and incomplete records for one reason or another, the number of cases for which data are available varies and is usually somewhat less than the number in the sample.

II. Academic Achievement

Two types of evidence were available with respect to academic achievement. One was derived from the marks reported by teachers. The other was based on a standardized reading test given to pupils in October 1965 and again in May 1966.

Data on school marks are organized in Tables I and II. Table I shows the median mark received, based on the four central academic subjects of English, mathematics, science and social studies, for the second and third marking period respectively.

Table I

Median of Marks for Second and Third Marking Periods

Percent of Pupils

Median Mark	Second Marking Period		Third Marking Period	
	OEP	NOEP	OEP	NOEP
87.5	3.3	8.5	3.4	11.3
82.5 - 87.4	6.9	12.5	10.7	13.2
77.5 - 82.4	16.3	19.0	12.6	16.3
72.5 - 77.4	18.4	18.1	17.6	20.2
67.5 - 72.4	16.3	20.2	22.9	17.5
62.5 - 67.4	15.5	12.5	18.3	11.3
--- - 62.4	23.3	9.3	14.5	10.1
Q3	78.0	81.4	78.2	82.4
Md	70.9	74.7	71.2	75.2
Q1	63.1	68.3	65.4	68.5
No. of cases	245	248	262	257

Table II shows the total number of marks below 70 received during three marking periods, based on the same four subjects. (The total possible number is 8). A mark below 70 may be considered definitely less than satisfactory (even though 65 is formally "passing"). The number of such marks received is an index of the degree to which the pupil is failing to come up to even rather minimal standards of academic performance.

Table II

Number of Marks Below 70 Received in Two Marking Periods

Number of Marks below 70	Percent of Pupils	
	OEP	NOEP
6 - 8	27.5	17.1
4 - 5	17.9	10.9
2 - 3	21.4	21.8
1	16.0	16.0
0	17.2	34.2
Q3	6.2	4.6
Md	3.6	2.0
Q1	1.5	0.7
No. of cases	262	257

The tables agree in showing that the Open Enrollment pupils have been less successful than their classmates in the same home-room so far as teacher marks are concerned. The typical OEP pupil has a median mark of just above [illegible]. About half his grades fall below this level, and represent a judgemement of failing or near failing work. One hopeful sign is that the

OEP pupils' grades are somewhat higher, relative to the comparison group, at the third than at the second marking period. The percent is the lowest category droppped from 23.3 to 14.5. It appears clear that the initial academic adjustment has not been an easy one for perhaps half of these pupils. One can only hope that the suggestion of improvement is borne out in the following years.

Tables IIIA and IIIB are based on the standardized reading test (Metropolitan Reading Test) administered in October, 1965 and May, 1966. Table IIIA shows distributions of initial test scores and final test scores separately for OEP and NOEP pupils. Table IIIB shows distributions of change scores from the initial to the final test. All results are reported the form of grade equivalents.

Table IIIA

Metropolitan Reading Test Scores of OEP and NOEP Pupils
(Percent of Pupils)

Grade Equivalent	October 1965		May 1966	
	OEP	NOEP	OEP	NOEP
11.0+	3.5	8.7	7.9	13.4
10.0 -10.9	6.6	9.6	12.6	13.0
9.0 - 9.9	12.1	11.3	11.7	10.8
8.0 - 8.9	13.7	12.1	11.7	16.9
7.0 - 7.9	11.3	11.3	12.6	11.7
6.0 - 6.9	16.4	19.7	14.0	16.9
5.0 - 5.9	17.2	17.2	20.0	12.6
4.0 - 4.9	16.0	7.1	8.7	3.0
3.0 - 3.9	3.1	2.9	0.9	1.7
Q3	8.7	9.4	9.6	10.1
Md	6.8	7.2	7.5	8.2
Q1	5.3	5.8	5.7	6.4
N	256	239	230	231

Gains in Metropolitan Reading Test Grade Equivalent from October 1965 to May 1966

Grade Equivalent	Percent of Cases OEP	NOEP
3.0+	0.9	1.5
2.5 - 2.9	3.3	2.9
2.0 - 2.4	3.8	4.9
1.5 - 1.9	10.3	12.1
1.0 - 1.4	16.0	17.5
0.0 - 0.4	13.6	20.9
-0.5 - (-0.1)	18.3	12.1
-1.0 - (-0.6)	5.2	4.9
-1.5 - (-1.1)	2.8	2.4
Below - 1.5	1.9	0.5
Q3	1.2	1.3
Md	0.6	0.7
Q1	-0.1	0.1
N	213	206

Table IIIA shows that the OEP pupils start out, on the average, about a half a grade behind both the NOEP pupils and the grade norms. At least in the sample that was picked for study, this is a slightly and not a severely retarded group. Furthermore, it is quite a heterogeneous group, including as it does 25% of pupils reading below grade 5.3 and 25% above 8.7. The last columns of Table IIIA show final grade equivalents, but not necessarily of exactly the same pupils since some were absent for the October test and some for the May test. There were about 20% of the pupils for whom one of the other test was missing.

An indication of reading gains can be gotten by comparing the October with the May results in Table IIIA. However, the picture can be seen more clearly in Table IIIB. This table shows change (usually gain, but actually drop in grade equivalent for about 25% of pupils) from October to May. The OEP pupils, who were initially slightly retarded, also gained slightly less. During the 7-month period that elapsed between the two testings the OEP pupils gained 6 months in age equivalent on the test, on the average, and the NOEP pupils 7 months. Thus, these pupils appear to be progressing in their new school at about the rate that had characterized their previous school history.

III. School Behavior and Discipline

A minimal indicator of conformity to the school and its expectations is the attendance record. To what extent did the OEP pupils, who had to make their way by bus or subway to a school some distance removed from their homes, maintain an attendance record comparable to that of neighborhood pupils from the usually more favored neighborhoods who were attending school near their own homes? The facts are shown in Table IV.

Table IV

Frequency Distribution of A bsence and Lateness for OEP and NOEP Pupils

Number of Days	Absent		Late	
	OEP	NOEP	OEP	NOEP
50	3.4	2.0		
40 - 49	1.5	2.8	0.4	
30 - 39	4.2	6.6	1.2	
20 - 29	9.2	11.7	6.1	
15 - 19	14.2	10.9	5.4	2.0
10 - 14	20.3	31.6	9.6	5.1
5 - 9	29.1	23.0	16.9	12.1
0 - 4	18.0	11.3	60.5	80.9
Q 3	17.2	18.7	8.8	4.2
Md	10.2	12.0	3.6	2.6
QI	5.7	7.5	1.5	1.1
No. of cases	261	256	261	256

We see that there is little difference in the attendance records of the two groups. So far as absences are concerned, the OEP pupils made a slightly better record, missing an average of only 10 days compared to 12 for the comparison group of local pupils. Lateness was more common among the OEP pupils perhaps due in part to erratic performance of the transportation system and there was a small group of OEP pupils who tended to be chronically late. However, we can say in general that the OEP pupils were faithful and responsible in their school attendance.

A second indicator of strain in adjustment to school is the occurrence of behavior that the school sees as calling for disciplinary (and hopefully remedial) action. The records of the guidance department and the Dean of Discipline were scanned for information on this point. Some difficulty was encountered in obtaining and using this information, due to variation from school to school in the form and the completeness of the records. For this reason, the data are reported in Table V only as percents of pupils for whom a given type of problem event occurred. Four categories of problem behavior were identified, and these are defined and commented on briefly below.

1. Referrals-This means referrals to some agency outside the school for help with a behavior or disciplinary problem. Such referrals occurred very rarely - actually only for 6 pupils, 4 in the OEP and 2 in the comparison group. It was suggested at one school, however, that more frequent referrals might have been made if adequate referral agencies had been available.
2. Discipline-This means that the pupil had been referred one or more time to an assistant principal, dean of discipline or other official handling disciplinary matters within the school. Schools appear to differ widely in the seriousness of offense for which this is done, and consequently in the frequency with which it occurs. In 7 of the 13 schools the percent is higher for OEP pupils, in 4 for NOEP pupils and in 2 the percent was the same for both.
3. Truancy- This implies that unexcused absences had occurred to the point where the school took some official action on the matter. In the 11 schools in which records on this point were obtained.

the occurrence was more frequent among the OEP pupils in 5, among the NOEP pupils in 2, and occurred equally frequently for both in 4.

4. Educational Difficulty. This means that the pupil came to the official attention of some administrative officer for poor school work. Records on this point were obtained for only 6 schools, and very little difference in frequency of occurrence was noted for the two groups.

Table V

Frequency of Certain Types of Problem Behavior for OEP and NOEP Pupils

School	Referral		Discipline		Truancy		Ed. Difficulty	
	OEP	NOEP	OEP	NOEP	OEP	NOEP	OEP	NOEP
A	4.5%	0%	50%	22.7%	0%	4.5%	--	--
B	5%	0%	80%	65%	9%	9%	--	--
C	0%	0%	4.5%	22.7%	4.5%	13.6%	--	--
D	0%	0%	72.7%	45.5%	5.3%	5.3%	--	--
E	0%	0%	4.8%	4.8%	--	--	95.2%	95.2%
F	5%	0%	20%	30%	--	--	40%	40%
G	5%	0%	35%	30%	5%	0%	100%	100%
H	0%	0%	17.4%	21.1%	17.4%	8.7%	82.6%	78.3%
I	0%	0%	17.4%	30.4%	13%	0%	69.6%	82.6%
J	0%	4.5%	81.8%	65%	4.5%	0%	--	--
K	0%	0%	70.6%	47.7%	17.6%	17.6%	100%	94.1%
L	0%	5.3%	79%	47.4%	5.3%	5.3%	--	--
M	0%	0%	35%	35%	60%	20%	--	--

In an attempt to get a more analytical and behavioral assessment of each pupil, home-room teachers were asked to complete a 30-item behavior check list on each OEP and NOEP pupil. The first 20 items were taken from a much longer set used by Ross et al* in a study to determine the dimensions of pupil behavior, 5 items being chosen to represent each of the 4 factors that they identified in that study, to wit, aggressive behavior, withdrawing behavior, passive-resistant hostility, and positive task-oriented behavior. The final items were drawn from a collection of teacher year-end report card comments, and include remarks that teachers are likely to make about pupils. These were classed as positive or negative, and scored to yield a general "favorableness" score. Means and standard deviations for OEP and NOEP pupils for each of the 6 scores are shown in Table VI.

Table VI

Teacher Characterizations of OEP and NOEP Pupils

	OEP		NOEP	
Type of characterization	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Ross et al				
Scale I - Aggressive behavior	1.01	1.57	0.89	1.53
Scale II - Withdrawing behavior	0.39	0.79	0.41	0.82
Scale III - Passive-resistant hostility	1.17	1.60	0.92	1.42
Scale IV - Positive task-oriented behavior	2.14	1.91	2.47	1.99
Report card type comments				
Positively toned	1.01	1.20	1.26	1.29
Negatively toned	2.27	1.89	1.91	1.76

*Ross, A. O., Lacey, H. M. and Perton, D.A.
The development of a behavior checklist for boys.
Child Development, 1965, 36, 1013, 1027.

Differences on all the scales are small, and most of them are of a size that could quite possibly have arisen by chance. There is a suggestion that the OEP pupils are perceived as more aggressive and "acting out", as more sensitive to discipline and criticism, as less conscientious and test-oriented. Such characterizations as "needs encouragement and extra help", "capable of doing better", "short attention span" tended to be used somewhat more often for the OEP pupils. However, it should be repeated that the differences were all small and possibly non-significant.

IV. Pupil Acceptance by Peers

Each pupil in each home-room studied was asked to rate all the other pupils in his home-room on a modification of the Ohio State Social Acceptance Scale. He was to assign each classmate to one of five categories:

1. a best friend.
2. a friend, but not a best friend.
3. OK, but not a friend.
4. not known.
5. not OK.

Two scores were derived for each pupil: the percent of his classmates who considered him a friend (categories 1 and 2), and the percent of his classmates who considered him "not OK" (category 5). The results are shown in Table VII.

Table VII

Percent of Classmates Rating OEP Pupils and NOEP Pupils as "Friend" and as "Not OK"

Percent of Classmates	Friend		Not OK	
	OEP	NOEP	OEP	NOEP
81-100	2.9	1.2	0	0
61-80	12.9	13.2	1.5	1.2
41-60	26.6	30.2	4.1	2.3
21-40	41.5	39.9	19.0	22.1
0-20	17.1	15.6	75.3	74.4
Q3	50.6	53.3	20.4	20.9
Md	37.1	38.4	10.9	10.8
Q1	25.4	27.1	4.0	3.3
No. of cases	263	256	263	256

We see from Table VII that for both OEP and NOEP pupils the typical pupil was perceived as a friend by about 40 o/o of his classmates, and was rejected as "not OK" by about 10 o/o. The distribution of choices and rejections is much the same for the OEP and NOEP pupils. There is no evidence that the Open Enrollment pupil finds difficulty in making friends among the pupils in his new school environment, or that rejection by the other pupils presents any special problem. Of course, our procedure of sampling chose classes in which there were several OEP pupils, and a fair number of the friendships may be within the OEP group.

An examination of the choices of OEP pupils by other OEP pupils in their class showed the percent designated as friend was 56, as compared to an over-all figure of approximately 38 percent. Thus, there is (quite naturally) some tendency for OEP pupils to choose each other. However, we estimate that about 35 percent of NOEP pupils designate OEP pupils as friends, so that these pupils do appear to be accepted by their classmates in their new school.

Pupils' Attitudes Toward School

One component of school adjustment is a set of favorable attitudes toward school, toward teachers and toward what one is called upon to learn. A 29-item attitude inventory was administered to the pupils in all the homerooms studied, and the responses of the OEP pupils and the selected NOEP pupils were analyzed. One analysis consisted in "scoring" the inventories, crediting the pupil with one point every time he endorsed a favorable statement about the school he was attending. Only those statements were scored where the field workers on the project were in complete agreement in identifying the favorable end. Three statements that did not apply to all students (i.e., about travel and about the lunchroom) were also excluded from the score.

The distribution of attitude scores for each group is presented in Table VIII.

TABLE VIII

Favorableness of Pupil Attitudes Toward School

No. of Favorable Responses	OEP	NOEP
26-28	0.9	0.4
23-25	9.9	13.0
20-22	22.4	21.2
17-19	24.1	32.0
14-16	22.4	20.3
11-13	13.8	10.4
8-10	4.3	2.2
5- 7	2.2	0.4
Q3	20.6	20.9
Md	17.4	18.1
Q1	14.1	15.3
No. of cases	232	231

An inspection of the table indicates that any differences between the two groups are very slight. If we consider only the lowest scores, we do find that these are predominantly in the OEP group. However, for the great bulk of pupils in the two groups, the distributions are almost completely overlapping. The median scores are, respectively, OEP, 17.4, and NOEP, 18.1. In each group, about two-thirds of the statements were marked in the positive direction, on the average.

A total score may cover up differences in the response to specific questions, some tending in one direction and some in the other, so a tally was made of the item responses. The percent of OEP pupils and NOEP pupils agreeing with each of the statements is shown in Table VIIIA. Though the values in the table generally parallel one another fairly closely, certain rather interesting differences emerge. There are also some instances in which differences might be expected, but in which they fail to emerge. The following points seem worth making:

1. The OEP pupils have, as a group, somewhat less favorable reactions to the teachers in the schools.
2. The OEP pupils are at least as positive as the NOEP pupils in reactions to their classmates. Item #8 is of special interest, as reflecting differences in standards of conduct in the two groups.
3. There is surprisingly little difference between the two groups in their perception of their school work (in the light of teacher evaluation of their academic success), both groups tending to be about the same in their reaction to its difficulty and its utility. However, a contrast to this is item #28, in which many OEP pupils express the feeling that they work hard but don't make progress. It appears, if one compares items 17 and 28, that most pupils are aware of limited success, but put the blame on themselves rather than the school. This may be an indication of the Negro's alleged negative self-image.

Table VIII A

Percent of OEP and NOEP Pupils Responding "Yes" to Attitude Items

	Item	Percent "Yes"	
		OEP	NOEP
1.	The teachers in this school want to help you.	.95	.96
2.	The teachers in this school expect you to work too hard.	.39	.34
3.	The teachers in this school have "teacher's pets."	.70	.63
4.	The teachers in this school are really interested in you.	.72	.77
5.	The teachers in this school know how to explain things clearly.	.70.	.85
6.	The teachers in this school are fair and square.	.50	.58
7.	The boys and girls in this school are "stuck up."	.33	.29
8.	The boys and girls in this school fight too much.	.31.	.55
9.	The boys and girls in this school are friendly.	.73	.68
10.	The boys and girls in this school will help me with my work.	.53	.46
11.	The boys and girls in this school know a lot.	.56	.47
12.	The boys and girls in this school don't want to learn.	.38	.35
13.	This school building is a pleasant place.	.66	.62
14.	This school has good lunches in the cafeteria.	.49	.44
15.	The principal in this school is friendly.	.80	.86
16.	The counselors at this school want to help you.	.91	.91
17.	The work at this school is too hard.	.16	.10
18.	The work at this school is too easy.	.10	.12
19.	The work we do is silly.	.08	.10
20.	What I am learning will be useful to me.	.93	.93

	Percent "Yes"	
	OEP	NOEP
21. What I have to study is a waste of time.	.09	.05
22. This school is better than last year's school.	.60	.70
23. The trip to and from school is too long.	.38	.16
24. I am glad to go to school away from my home neighborhood.	.69	.37
25. I wish I could go back to my old school.	.28	.22
26. I wish I didn't have to go to school at all.	.26	.22
27. This is the best school I know.	.27	.37
28. I work hard in school but don't seem to get anywhere.	.50	.32
29. I've learned more this year than any earlier year.	.73	.76

VI. Parental Reactions

In order to get some sense of parental response to the OEP assignment of pupils, a brief questionnaire was sent to the parents of the OEP and NOEP pupils. The address was taken from the school records. A total of 263 OEP and 253 NOEP questionnaires were sent out. It may be of some interest that from this mailing to the address that appeared in the school records, 32 envelopes were returned as undeliverable. From the remainder, 169 completed questionnaires were received, 86 from OEP and 83 from NOEP parents. The return is a good deal less complete than one would desire. However, our resources did not permit follow-ups or more intensive efforts to get parent participation.

In Table IX each question on the questionnaire is set forth, together with the response alternatives. These are then followed by the percent of respondents within the OEP and NOEP groups choosing each alternative.

Table IX

Parental Reactions Toward

Child's Present School

(No, if cases: OEP=86, NOEP=83)

1. Your child is in a new school this year. Does he (or she) like it better or worse than last year?

	OEP	NOEP
Better	86.0%	61.4%
Worse	2.3%	14.5%
About the same	11.6%	24.0%

2. If he goes by bus or train, is the trip worth it?

	OEP	NOEP
Yes	92.0%	29.0%
No	2.3%	3.6%
Doesn't go by bus or train	5.8%	67.5%

3. Is he learning more or less than last year?

	OEP	NOEP
More	87.2%	77.1%
Less	3.5%	8.4%
About the same	9.3%	14.5%

4. How about friends in the new school?

	OEP	NOEP
Has Plenty	93.0%	83.1%
Doesn't have enough	7.0%	16.9%

5. How about friends in the neighborhood?

	OEP	NOEP
Has time to see them	81.4%	90.4%
Doesn't have time to see them	18.6%	9.6%

6. How often have you been able to get to parent meetings at school?

	OEP	NOEP
Not at all	54.7%	34.9%
Once or twice	30.2%	41.0%
Several times	15.1%	24.0%

---

7. How often have you spoken to one of your child's teachers or guidance counselors?

	OEP	NOEP
Not at all	20.9%	10.8%
Once or twice	47.7%	5-.6%
Several times	31.4%	38.5%

An inspection of Table IX indicates that parents of Open Enrollment pupils express predominantly favorable attitudes toward the school experience being provided for their children. In most cases, they report that their child likes his present school better than the previous one, is learning more, and has plenty of friends in the new school. The travel to the new school is seldom seen as a serious problem. The OEP parents appear to have somewhat less contact with the school than do the comparison group of neighborhood parents, possibly because of physical remoteness, but they view it with favor.

VII. Generalized Teacher and Staff Reaction

A questionnaire about OEP pupils was circulated to the 7th grade teachers of each school where data was gathered, and to the principal and members of his administrative team. The items are presented, and item responses summarized in

Table X. Percents are determined separately for teachers and for administrative personnel.

Table X

Teacher and Administrator Reactions to Open Enrollment Program Pupils

N=137 FOR TEACHERS, 31 FOR ADMINISTRATION ALL #s are %

Academic Progress: How well does the typical Open Enrollment pupil make out in understanding and mastering his school work?

	Teachers	Administrative Staff
Very Well	0.7	0.0
Well	3.6	0.0
Average	41.6	32.2
Poorly	50.4	54.8
Very Poorly	3.6	12.9

Interest: How is the interest of the typical Open Enrollment pupil in school work and school success?

	Teachers	Administration
Very High	2.2	0.0
High	3.6	0.0
Satisfactory	40.1	41.9
Low	47.4	54.8
Very Low	6.6	3.2

Effort: How regularly and conscientiously does the typical Open Enrcllment pupil apply himself to his school work? Does he do assigned tasks, study his lessons, and try to learn?

	Teachers	Administration
Very Well	1.5	0.0
Well	8.0	9.7
Fair	45.3	41.9
Poorly	40.9	45.2
Very Poorly	4.4	3.2

Conduct in class: What is the classroom behavior of the typical Open Enrollment pupil like?

	Teachers	Administration
Very Good	2.9	0.0
Good	3.6	0.0
Satisfactory	36.5	41.9
Poor	51.1	54.8
Very Poor	5.8	3.2

Generally speaking, on a 5-point scale the respondents divided themselves about equally between the neutral middle step representing a somewhat negative evaluation. Only a few expressed a positive view of the typical OEP pupil, and only a few endorsed the most negative option. The substantial amount of negative feeling expressed about "the typical Open Enrollment pupil" seems to be in some contrast to the small differences in ratings of specific OEP and NOEP pupils shown in Table VI. The School personnel

appear to be somewhat more negative toward the Open Enrollment Program in general than they are to specific pupils who exemplify it.

Summary Statement

As one looks at the various aspects of the Open Enrcllment Program as it functions in the New York City schools, a number of points stand out, some implying difficulties and some implying a positive and satisfactory adjustment.

1. There seems to be no question that the pupils have difficulty with the academic aspects of the program. Though the OEP pupils are only slightly retarded in reading, on the average, in comparison with other pupils from their own classes and in comparison with national norms, they show a high incidence of unsatisfactory marks in the core academic subjects.

2. The OEP pupils generally attend school regularly, and within our sample the overt signs of disciplinary problems are not particularly greater than for other pupils in the same classes. Though teachers report a somewhat greater incidence of overt and covert hostility, the differences between OEP pupils and others in their classes are small.

3. The OEP pupils are accepted by the pupils in their class, and do not seem to lack for friends.

4. OEP pupils expressed attitudes toward school are generally favorable, and little, if any, different from those of their classmates. They are conscious of difficulty with their school work, but do not see the school or the school program as inappropriate for them.

5. Parents of the OEP pupils are predominently favorable towards, even enthusiastic about their child's present school. Parents of other pupils show a fairly positive response, but are more often critical. However, there were only two or three instances in which the criticism focussed upon the introduction of out-of-area pupils into the school.

6. By contrast, teachers and administrative officers in the schools tended to view

OEP pupils with a predominantly negative tone. There were wide variations in response, and some respondents were loathe to characterize OEP pupils in general. However, the flavor of ratings received, and perhaps even more of off-the-record comments made, was clearly predominantly critical and negative.

PROJECT STAFF

Research Director:

Dr. Robert L. Thorndike	Professor, Psychology and Education Teachers College, Columbia University

Research Staff:

Miss Linda Cimicata	Teacher of English Junior and Senior High Schools
Mr. Edward Lederman	Teacher, Full-time Doctoral Student in Measurement and Evaluation
Mr. Edward Morante	Teacher of Health and Physical Education
Mr. Joseph Snyder	Research Assistant, Measurement and Evaluation